

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/551,629	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOHDA, TORU	
	<b>Examiner</b> JAY R. RIPLEY	<b>Art Unit</b> 3679	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) JAY R. RIPLEY

(2) Mr. Amir N. Penn

**Date of Interview:** 1 July 2008

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
n/a

Claims discussed:  
3, 6, 8 and 12-13

Prior art documents discussed:  
Wayne (U.S. 5,323,812)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** RCE/T1

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 12:40 P.M.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed were the instant amendments to claims 3 and 8, specifically the recitation of "said second sleeve movable independently, at least partly, from said first sleeve" in lines 53-54 of both of the noted claims. The Examiner noted that merely being "movable" did not distinguish over the teachings of Wayne, since Wayne taught two distinctly separate components and that, as such, allowed for independent movement. The Examiner suggested the following language to replace the noted recitations: "said second sleeve in operation movable independently in relation to said first sleeve". Further, the Examiner noted that claims 12-13 would then fail to further limit their respective independent claims and should be cancelled should the suggested amended claims language be found acceptable. Applicant agreed to amend/cancel the claims as suggested by the Examiner by Examiners Amendment.